

VOL. IV. 第四卷 第 10 號

THE
CHINESE RECORDER
AND
MISSIONARY JOURNAL.

Devoted to the Extension of Knowledge relating to the Religious,
Literary, Civilisation, History and Statistics of
China and adjacent Countries—With a
Special Department for Notes,
Queries and Replies.

MARCH, 1872.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE.	PAGE.
CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:	
Mr. Ekins and Co-operation	363
Philology	364
The Time of Our Saviour's Crucifixion and Resurrec- tion	367
The Late Mrs. E. C. Smith	368
men	369
Causes of Hostility to Mis- sionaries	370
Proclamation Forbidding Idol Worship	371
Indications of Diplomacy	372
Peng Sui	373
Memoirs of a Native Christian	374
Connection of Chinese and Hebrew	375
NOTES, QUERIES AND REPLIES:	
Two Articles of Luxury	376
DATA:	
List of Books for Sale, 2nd and 3rd pages of cover.	
In Press, 1st and 4th pages of cover.	

FOOCHOW.

Printed by Roscoe, Mangal & Co.

THE CHINESE RECORDER.

AND

MISSIONARY JOURNAL.

VOL. 4. FOOCHOW, MARCH, 1872.

No. 10

MR. EDKINS AND COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY.

BY P. VON M.

See "*Connection of Chinese and Hebrew*" by Rev. J. Edkins, *Chinese Recorder*, Vol. III. pgs. 203, 323, and Vol. IV pgs. 23, 48, 74, 102, 123 and 182.

The comparison of two languages results in the tracing of the words of both back to one common origin. The superficial critic judges simply by the external form. To the contrary—the rigidly critical mind submits to the established principles and rules,—weighs each letter and endeavors to discover its proper value. The highest aim of the etymologist is here realized in the consciousness of having followed the path of just, impartial criticism. He is never quite sure in his suppositions: the discovery of a moment may dissipate his most cherished hopes, and render of no avail the studies and researches of years.

A mere comparison between the dictionaries often shows at first sight something seducing, which a more searching study and analysis rarely fulfill. There are long lists of very similar Greek and Hebrew words, but they do not prove that both languages are to be derived from the same origin.

But what does a "*connection of Chinese and Hebrew*" really mean? A genuine kinship can only be proved by drawing the other Semitic dialects equally into the comparison, as far as they are equally entitled, or sister

languages, as far as they only find through each other full explanation. But that the three Semitic groups had an individual existence from the beginning, is proved by scholars like S. de Sacy, Gesenius, E. Renan and others. Each of these three groups is marked by peculiar characteristics which secure to it oneness and independence.

The Hebrew or the middle group has preserved its individuality and primeval purity by retaining its gutturals and sibilants. It represents the purest type and is the key of the other dialects.

The T in the Aramean or northern group is a sign of a low language (as it is in low German).

The southern or Arabic group ought always to be kept separated, as it has peculiar marks, which point to an original formation.

To prove that the T in certain Aramean words is older than the S, which we find in Hebrew, is a difficult task. The Genesis was written c. 1500 B. C., while the first Aramean monuments in Daniel appear to be written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanus, 160 B. C. Besides other languages show the S plainly: Koptic shomt=Hebrew shalosh (three), snač=sknayim (two); Phenicien Ze=Hebrew zeh (this), salus=shalosh (three). The best proof, however, is to be found in the old Babylonian: where the modern Syrochaldean shows a T, we find that the old Babylonian sides with the Hebrew and gives the older S. Alterations like Tyros, Chaldean tūr, are to be considered as innovations,

as not only the Hebrew, but also the Phenicien language already began at that time to assimilate with the Aramean branch.

Mr. Edkins says p. 203, that Hebrew and Chinese "were probably dialects of a still more venerable mother speech." It is therefore clear, that he tries to trace back both languages to a common origin. To prove this, he ought first to show, how two tongues could so differently develop themselves from one mother speech. For more than 3000 years the Semitic stock has not been subjected to any alteration of roots; the modern Bedouin use the same roots, as Samuel did, the Arabic of to-day corresponds with the oldest Hebrew roots. We have as yet no authentic instance that at the introduction of letters a language has enlarged the old roots with new ideas. What right have we to consider such expansion of the root as certain? Does not the Chinese itself show, that such expansion was not necessary for the introduction of new ideas? It is too often believed, that the element, which appears simple, is older than a more complicated one. This is the yet undestroyed remnant of the Scholastic method of the Middle ages. The human genius generally begins rather with the dimly outlined and obscure idea; in his first actions slumber the elements of the most developed conscience. Then the analysis discovers the degrees of this arbitrary development, but it is certainly wrong to believe, that the last step, which we arrive at through the analysis, is the first in the order of the facts.

The idea to reduce all languages to a monosyllabic origin fascinated even men like Delitzsch and Fürst, but their arguments are perfectly refuted by Pott and Burnouf, and E. Renan in his "histoire des langues semitiques" p. 449 goes so far as to call "les analyses de racines un jeu pueril!"

Let us now see, how much the eight laws, which Mr. Edkins proposes, are able to assist our comparative philology.

I. "The initial sibilant often found preceding two radical consonants may be confidently set aside as a "Semitic prefix." When, let us ask, is the initial sibilant ever a "Semitic prefix," to enable Mr. Edkins to confidently set it aside? What was its signification, which had the power to modify, when prefixed to any root, the idea, it originally had?

P. 204, No. 2. To compare Hebrew *sela* with English *rock*, is, I am sorry to say, a mistake, as *rock*, Italian *rocca*, Spanish *roca*, French *roche*, are derived from the Latin *rupes*, *rupica* (like *avis avica*, *cutis cutica*) and is formed like Latin *appropriare*, Italian *approcciare*, French *approcher*.

P. 204, No. 11. Hebrew *shaba* 'he swore' is a denominative from *sheba* 'seven' and derived the idea of swearing from the Hebrew custom, that "oaths were confirmed either by seven victims, offered in sacrifice (Gen. 21, 28), or by seven witnesses and pledges," so that nothing is to be found like the idea of binding, which the Chinese 縛 has.

II. "The medial consonant, if it be *resh* or *lamed* may be suspected as not a genuine radical letter. It may have been inserted as *R* in the German "sprache," when compared with the English "speech."

The Sanscrit root for to speak and *sprechen* is *brû*, the *R* is therefore old in *sprechen* and only dropped in speech, Anglo saxon still retains the *R* in *sprecan*, *spreocan*.

P. 324. According to the principles laid down above, we cannot agree with Mr. Edkins, when he considers the simple root, "stripped of appendages," as the beginning, from which the other words are expanded. We have no right to think so, as we cannot prove it.

P. 325, No. 4. Mr. Edkins is unhappy in the choice of his examples: Hebrew berith (covenant), which he derives from a root bārath (to cut) is connected with bārāh=Arabic bara, ultimae waw; Hebrew bārar, Arabic barra (to sever) seem to be related.

P. 325, No. 6. Mr. Edkins compares Hebrew dārash with Greek Zeteo (to seek) and says: "the initial Z has taken the place of D; as in the Hebrew dārash the final Sh has taken the place of T." But such an indeterminate application of letters is certainly against the most essential principles of philology.

P. 325, No. 8. Hebrew cheres means dry, arid, hot. The name, that Jesaiah gives to Cyrus is Koresh, which, with the Fend choro, chur, aluro, Persian chūr, hūr point to a root hr. The word cheres has nothing to do with it. The esh in koresch is only a termination, as the esh in daryāwesh. Koresch, Cyrus, is shortened from kūreshūd (brightness of the sun).

P. 325, No. 15. We do not think it possible to compare Greek teko with Hebrew dāalag (to burn), but perhaps, as Gesenius does, the latter with Greek derkomay, where the lamed apparently lies in the rho. Certainly, however, Greek teko and English torch have nothing in common, as torch is derived from Latin torquere (to twist), part pass tortum, new Latin tortisius.

P. 325, No. 20. Hebrew peleg (stream). To this root Gesenius, on whose opinion Mr. Edkins depends so much, that all his Latin and Greek quotations are taken from his Hebrew dictionary, compares Latin flu—o, flue—tus, Greek phly—o, pelagos and Hebrew pal, pōl, bulire, wallen, Welle, all of which show more a root pal, than pag. English break does therefore not belong to this root, but is the same with Latin frangere (fragere), Greek rhegnymi (which lost an initial digamma).

P. 326. "These twenty examples ———originally one."

But where are those Hebrew words, which do not begin with K, T, P and G, L, B, e. g. those that begin with resh?

P. 326. "This identity———could grow." According to this paragraph Chinese and Hebrew were once the same language. This language had no "distinction of genders, article, verb paradigm" &c. Only when "the creative genius of Semitic grammar (?) commenced its work," the Hebrews got a sort of language. This genius occupied himself first with expansion of the primeval word into a dissyllable. Just according to his vague fancy (it would seem) he added some consonants to the root. After having done this to his satisfaction "the complicated ramifications of Hebrew accidence" were able to grow. All this our genius did so well, that since several thousands of years nothing was to be altered. But—if we believe, that language formed words itself, we must logically go further and believe that man was once without language altogether and—the theory of Darwin is proved! And actually p. 323 Mr. Edkins lets Adam begin his language by imitating the cries of animals, the noise of concussion, of walking and so forth, and "acquire a small stock of monosyllables," "to begin with." Vol. IV p. 25.

The comparison drawn between Chinese 明 ming (bright, the dawn) and English to-morrow is attractive, but owing to the Hebrew, its logical value is lost. The Hebrew māchār is contracted of ma'achār (the following, posterior, subsequent) and is therefore not connected at all with the signification of morning, bright, but means with yōm (day) the following day; after to-morrow adds shetishī (third) to it. We have therefore to give up "the hope for the identification of all these words"

with the Chinese 明 ming (bright).

P. 50. Mr. Edkins could probably not find the Hebrew word for Gehenna in the dictionary of Gesenius and does not, on that account I presume, give the Hebrew pronunciation for it. We will add a short explanation. In the south-eastern quarter of Jerusalem was a valley, in which human sacrifices were offered to Moloch and which had the name *gey 'hinnôm* valley of Hinnom. The word Gehenna, as we use it now, is taken from the Arabic, which took from the Hebrew, as Mr. Edkins rightly observes.

P. 50. "Gesenius compares—Welsh haul."

Comparative philology has made rapid progress since the time of Gesenius and comparisons like *castus-sacer per transpositionem* ought to find no place in the new editions of his dictionary. *Castus* is generally derived from *candere*, which is connected with *canere* (like *ardere* and *arere*), so that "we are saved from the possibility of venturing" on the comparison with the Chinese 潔 kit to wash.

P. 50. The Tibetan *kor* may be the Latin *circulus*, the Hebrew *gālal*, root *gal* is more likely to be Latin *glomerare*, *globus*, Greek *kyllo*, *ky-lindo*.

P. 51. Expressions as, "the root may have had originally a final Ng, which was dropped and its place taken by R and L;" or p. 184, "the Hebrew syllabary contracted itself, threw out the final Ng, and borrowed the M final to put in its place," need no discussion, for their philological value is patent to the most superficial observer.

P. 74. A nice example of modern philology, is English *round*—Chinese 輪 lun (a wheel, to revolve). In spite of all arbitrary alterations of consonants, which Mr. Edkins proposes (T, D—R, L, Th; G, K—ayin, cheth, he; beth, pe—waw), he cannot ac-

complish this comparison. *Round* comes, as we all know, from the Latin *rotundus* (*rota*), Provencial *redon*, old French *roond*, *reond*, modern French *rond*, all point to the path taken by English *round* and German *rund*.

The Greek *redon* (*rose*) cannot possibly be derived from a root, that "began with L and ended with T or X" (!), as it originates from *vrdon* and has *var* as root.

P. 74. When comparing Hebrew *tachatz* with *neco* and 虐 *nok*, what does Mr. Edkins with the final *tz*? In p. 75 No. 6, he says that the *d* in *takad* is a "Hebrew suffix!" Is then perhaps the *tz* in *tachatz* also a suffix? In Hebrew grammar both do not occur. See Prof. Pott, *Encycl. of Ersch and Gruber*, art. *Indogerm lang* p. 8: it is le plus essentiel principe of the comparative philology, that the consonants are considered as something fixed, otherwise all letters may, by turns, play the same rôle.

P. 75, No. 7. Hebrew *lācham* (*ate*), which we here meet for the second time having a different signification, is not only in form, but also in signification the same with *tacham* made war; confer Arabic *sadhagha* (to chew), II conj. to fight, soldiers in battle are hyperbolically said to devour their enemies.

P. 75, No. 5. Modern investigation has proved, that Hebrew 'Arama "the high plateau where the Aramean race became settled," has nothing to do with *rūm* (high), but is composed of *ar* and *am*, meaning the land of Am, as Armini means the land of Mini (Armenia), Ar-pakhshad &c. cf. Bunsen, *Outlines* I, p. 180.

P. 76, No. 6. Mr. Edkins puts *rākash* and 得 *tek* together, having just the page before, p. 75, No. 6 compared the same *tek* with Hebrew *lāgach*. What have *rākash* and *lāgach* in common?

P. 76, No. 7. The Latin "subditiōe (under authority)" is considered to be most probably derived from dare, kindred with deditio, and perhaps contracted from it. Then the root is D A and Hebrew rādāh and Chinese 治 dat show a younger form than Latin.

P. 76. With Latin lacryma, Greek dakry, Welsh dagr, tear, zähre, Chinese 滴 tek (to drop) Mr. Edkins compares the Arabic tagthir (not taktir) from the root gathara, the prefixed ta being the sign of the nomen actionis. Now tagthir has not the signification of distilling at all, but is either nomen actionis conj. II, and means "ligno agallocho sufflavit se. vestem," or is a noun and means "morbus quo quis urinam retinere non potest," a signification, which Mr. Edkins scarcely could have had in view, having nothing to do with tear (Freitag, lex Arab. III p. 464).

P. 77. About the comparison of Hebrew le, ēl, Latin ad, Celtic at, to and Chinese 到 tao, 至 ti, we have nothing to say, except that 至, according to Mr. Edkins' system, originally sounded tit or tot. Then the beauty of the comparison is lost at once. Certain it is, that English th and Greek theta "cannot have been developed from the t. Cf. Bunsen, Outlines I p. 78.

P. 124. We have shown, that the Hebrew or the Semitic languages in general have *not* been altered for thousands of years and the sentence "the complicated alphabets of existing languages are modern" is applicable neither to them or to the Arian languages.

P. 125, No. 8. Hebrew chad, 'achād is here compared with Greek heis and Chinese 孤 ku and 個 ko, both have lost a final T. This comparison is, as far as the Greek is concerned, impossible, when we know, that the root of heis (gen. henos) is hen, Latin unus, English one.

P. 125, No. 11. The English word glad has nothing in common with the Latin gaudeo, except its signification. The root of gaudeo is ga and Greek gaio, gayros are derivation of of the same root. Glad and the German glatt (smooth) are connected with the Latin glatiare, glaciare, glacies.

P. 125, No. 18. The double comparison of the Chinese 過 kuo (to pass by, miss, fault) shows the system of Mr. Edkins in its whole debility, as he uses the word here as kat, on page 104 as kap!

P. 125, No. 20. How can we compare Hebrew chay (root chāvay) with Chinese 活 gat living, as Mr. Edkins says: "language is *always* multiplying itself (p. 124)!" As he considers Hebrew juniorto Chinese, the former has already thrown away the final T.

The method of Romanizing used by Mr. Edkins is somewhat obscure. In Semitic languages, where the greatest importance lies with the consonants, we have to use a certain method, to make the words recognizable. Mr. Edkins gives four kinds of Romanizing for Hebrew ayin: it is either not expressed at all, or g, or gh, or ng.

In conclusion we give an example, how far astray superficial criticism in etymology may lead the student. In the book before us—the Chinese 割 kat seems to have been regarded with partial eyes by the Author. It is compared no less than 14 times—so that we learn, Hebrew chārah is developed from the same root as kātab, in which two forms, not a single consonant agrees!

THE TIME OF OUR SAVIOUR'S CRUCIFIXION AND RESURRECTION.

BY REV. T. P. CRAWFORD.

Our Saviour was crucified on Wednesday, and rose from the dead about sunset on our Saturday.

The reader will be somewhat startled at the boldness of the above propo-

osition, and at once ask, can this position be sustained in opposition to the generally received opinion, that he was crucified on Friday and rose again on Sunday morning? I believe it can, and proceed to offer the principal proofs on which it rests.

Our Saviour, on various occasions, foretold his own death and resurrection. The Evangelists, in recording his remarks, say indiscriminately, "The third day," "In three days," "After three days," he would rise again. Now there is a slight vagueness about these expressions. The former two may mean something less, the latter something more than three full days.

But the Saviour (Matt. 12th Ch. 40 v.) removes all ambiguity, by saying, in the most *deliberate* and *definite* manner that, "As Jonas was three *days* and three *nights* in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

Nothing less than three entire revolutions of the earth will fill the measure of this language. At least, but a *small fraction* of the first and last part of the time indicated could be left out without doing great violence to his words.

The chief priests and Pharisees understood him to mean three full days and nights; for they came to Pilate, saying, "Sir we *remember* that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, *after* three days I will rise again. Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure till the third day i. e. till the end of the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away."

In studying this subject, we should constantly bear in mind the fact that the Jews reckoned their days from sunset to sunset, and understand their words accordingly.

Luke (23d Ch. 54 v.) when speaking of the time when the Saviour was buried says: It was the preparation

day, and the Sabbath *drew on* (epiphasko) literally *began to dawn* by the rising of the moon and stars as the Saviour's body was laid in the grave about sundown of that day. What Sabbath does Luke here refer to? Was it the common *weekly* Sabbath, or was it the yearly *Passover* Sabbath?

It has been too readily taken for granted that it was the weekly Sabbath, and this is the root of the prevailing error as to the time of the resurrection.

We know *certainly* that the burial was completed just at the beginning of the *yearly Passover Sabbath* which was the day after the Jews eat the Paschal lamb. This strictly speaking was *the Passover day*. It is also called the Preparation day, and occurred on the 14th of the first month; the 15th or day following, was "*a Sabbath*, a holy convocation in which no servile work was to be done" according to the Law of Moses. See Lev. 23 Ch. 5-7 verses.

But we by no means know that it was also the *weekly Sabbath*. True, the two would occasionally fall on the same day; but there are *seven* probabilities against *one* that it so happened on that particular year. John (19 Ch. 31 v.) conveys the idea that they did not coincide at that time. He says: "The Jews, therefore, because it was the Preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day, (for that Sabbath day was a *high* day) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken" &c. The words in brackets are thrown in by John apparently for the express purpose of informing us that it was the high Passover Sabbath, in contradistinction to the ordinary weekly one to which he referred. Otherwise the parenthetical clause would be useless so far as we can see.

The truth is, our Saviour was in the grave during *two* Sabbaths, being

buried at or a little after the beginning of the one, and rising at or a little after the end of the other. By keeping in view the fact that there are two Sabbaths the difficulties in the *records* begin to disappear and the various statements of the four Evangelists readily harmonize.

Let us see if this be so. We will begin with Mark as he mentions the first transaction after the burial. He says (16 Ch. 1 v.): "And when the (festival) Sabbath was *past*, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James had *bought* sweet spices that they *might come* and anoint him." Next Luke says (23 Ch. 55-56 vs.): "And the women who came with him from Galilee followed after and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid, and they returned and *prepared* spices and ointments, and rested the (weekly) Sabbath day according to the commandment." Thus we see they kept a Sabbath *before buying* the "spices," and another *after preparing* them. So there must have been an intervening day on which they bought and prepared the spices and ointments. If we maintain that he was in the grave but one Sabbath, then there would be no time left in which they could do the work; for Luke says he was buried at the *beginning*, and Matthew says he rose at the *end* of the Sabbath day. This would give him but one day in the grave instead of three days and three nights as he had most deliberately foretold. Matthew (28 Ch. 1-12 vs.) says: "In the *end* of the (weekly) Sabbath, as it *began to dawn* towards the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to *see* the sepulchre, and they found the stone rolled away," saw an angel who told them the Lord was risen, &c., "and as they ran, with fear and great joy to tell his disciple, Jesus met them saying, all hail! Go tell my disciples" &c. Matthew says nothing however about their having told

them what they had seen and heard.

The Greek word (*epiphosko*) here used by Matthew and rendered "*began to dawn*" is the same word used by Luke (23 Ch. 55 v.) and rendered there the Sabbath "*drew on*," evidently referring to the shining out of the moon and stars as the Saviour was beyond all doubt buried just at night fall. The use of the word is the same in both cases and indicates the beginning of the day according to the Jewish reckoning.

See Liddell and Scott's Greek dictionary. *Epiphosko*—"To shine out, as of the sun and moon." Robinson's—"To dawn on. Trope of the Jewish day beginning at sunset, to begin."

John (20 Ch. 11-18 vs.), like Matthew relates the events of the *evening*, as a comparison of the accounts will show, adding some things which he left out: such as that "Mary stood without the sepulchre weeping; that she mistook Jesus for the gardener; and that she went and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and what he said to her." Mark (16 Ch. 9-11 vs.) completes the events of the evening by adding: "now when Jesus was risen *early the first day of the week*—he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils, and she went and told the disciples as they mourned and wept, and they, when they heard that he was alive, and had been seen by her, believed not."

This unbelief on the part of the disciples would naturally throw Mary into a dubious, anxious state of mind, and perhaps she spent a sleepless night over it. At all events she rose before day, "while it was yet dark," and went again to the sepulchre to satisfy herself, as I suppose, that the events of the previous evening were not an illusion.

John (20 Ch. 1-11 vs.) begins the story of the morning by saying: The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early when it was *yet*

dark, to the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Then she runneth and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them. They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him." At this visit Mary did not see the Lord, only the stone rolled away from the sepulchre; and, as the disciples had disbelieved her former statements, she is now, by a *natural law* of the mind, careful to state only that which she can submit to ocular demonstration, i. e. the fact that the grave is *empty*.

While she was gone to tell the disciples and remains discussing with them these strange facts and arguing in favor of his resurrection, "The women from Galilee and others with them, (Luke 24 Ch. 1-12 vs.) came *very early* in the morning—Mark adds, "at the rising of the sun"—to the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and Mark adds, they said among themselves, who shall roll us away the stone? And they found the stone rolled away, and they entered in and found not the body of the Lord Jesus" &c.; and they returned from the sepulchre and told all these things to the eleven and to all the rest. It was Mary Magdalene (first in the evening and first in the morning) and Mary the mother of James, and the other women with them who told these things to the Apostles, and their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not. But John adds, that Peter and that other disciple whom Jesus loved, arose and ran unto the sepulchre, and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass."

The other disciples seem not to have had faith enough even to go and see whether these things were

true or not. Here ends the events of the morning.

Thus we see that Mary Magdalene had nothing to do with *bringing* the "spices" to anoint the Saviour's body in the morning, or with the conversation among the women who brought them about "who should roll away the stone."

When once our attention is called to the fact that there are two Sabbaths in the record regarding the burial and resurrection instead of one, the difficulties disappear, and there is a natural harmony between the four Evangelists; all parties act and speak consistently, and there is no longer any necessity to put a forced interpretation on any text of Scripture. The Saviour had ample time to remain "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," and to fulfil, literally, his own deliberate prediction. The women had also time to prepare the spices and ointments and wait till the guard had performed their three days watch at the grave, before they came to perform their pious labors.

How forced and unsatisfactory is the other view of the question.

This mode of interpreting the time of the resurrection does by no means attempt to overthrow the ancient tradition of the church that Christ rose from the dead on the first day of the week; for Mark settles that point as well as Matthew. But it holds that it took place in the evening just after the close of the Jewish Sabbath and in the *beginning of their* first day of the week, instead of in the morning as commonly supposed. I know of but two objections which might be urged against this view of the subject.

First: It might be asked, why would the women wait for three days and four nights before coming to anoint the body?

Answer.—For the very good reason that they could not do it sooner.

It was under the guard and seal of the Governor. Besides being "wrapped in a hundred pounds weight of myrrh and aloes" and the weather cool, there was no danger of its becoming offensive by that time.

Second. Why would the two disciples going to Emmaus (Luke 24 ch. 21 v.) on the afternoon of the first day of the week say to Jesus: Besides all this, to-day is the third day since all these things were done.

Answer: Because they had the fact in their minds that Jesus had said while yet alive that after three days he would rise again, and counting from the time of his *burial* on the beginning of Thursday, as my present mode of interpreting the circumstances maintains, it would be the third day since the last of "these things were done." If they did not have his burial and probable resurrection in their minds, I can see no reason why they should refer to the third day at all. Should any one say that they referred to the time of the crucifixion as the point from which they reckoned, I reply that while at first view it seems to be so, still a close and attentive study of the context makes it more probable that they counted from the *burial*. And if so, the third day would not be past till sunset, notwithstanding he had risen the evening before. If we could be certain of the *year* in which our Saviour was crucified, by an astronomical calculation, the day of the week could be ascertained with mathematical certainty.

I now submit this article to the readers of *The Chinese Recorder* hoping it may aid in removing some of the many difficulties which have long surrounded the burial and resurrection of our Saviour.

I regard the subject of great importance to missionaries who have to translate the Gospels into the various languages of the heathen world.

If my arguments are unsound I should be glad to see them overthrown by those which shall better harmonize the statements of the four Evangelists.

TUNGCHOW, Oct. 16th 1871.

THE LATE MRS. E. C. BRIDGMAN.

BY REV. HENRY BLODGET.

Most of the readers of *The Recorder* have heard of the recent death of Mrs. E. C. Bridgman at Shanghai. It is fitting that its columns should contain some notice of the life and labours of one who served her Master in this field so faithfully and for so long a time, and whose efforts were so signally blessed. Many of her friends in other lands, as well as her missionary associates in China, will be gratified to know more of her than the few facts which they now possess. The record of what she has wrought will serve also to stimulate and encourage younger missionaries, especially those whose circumstances may in some respects resemble hers.

Mrs. E. C. Bridgman was born in Derby, Conn. U. S. A., May 6 1805. Her maiden name was Eliza Jane Gillette. Her father, Mr. Canfield Gillette, was a merchant in his occupation, and a prominent citizen in the town. The family in its origin was from the French Huguenots, and had been driven from France by religious persecution. She was the youngest of nine children, and was baptized in infancy in the Episcopal church of her native town, of which both her parents were members.

Her father died when she was but ten years of age, and the other members of the family being dead, or having removed to other places, the mother with this daughter, in the spring of the following year, left Derby and went to New Haven to reside. While attending School in

this city, during a powerful revival of religion her mind was greatly exercised in regard to her own salvation. At length she obtained peace, and was confirmed as a member of the Episcopal church, under the pastoral care of the Rev. Henry Crosswell. The date of this event was February 1st, 1821, in the sixteenth year of her life.

Her interest in Foreign Missions commenced about the time of her conversion. It was at first awakened by reading Buchanan's *Researches in the East*, a book which had a powerful influence in originating Foreign Missions from the United States of America. This interest was greatly increased by a farewell service held in connection with the departure of the second band of missionaries for the Sandwich Islands in the year 1822. From that time she cherished the desire of engaging personally in the missionary work. The reading of the *Memoirs of Harriet Newell* and others of like spirit deepened this desire. One thing prevented its immediate accomplishment. She could not leave her mother. The will of God was plain, and she waited patiently.

At the early age of sixteen years, Miss Gillette became an assistant teacher in the Boarding School in New Haven of which she had been a member, and subsequently having removed with her mother to New York in 1823, was there engaged in similar duties. Her position however was soon exchanged for that of Principal of a Boarding School of young ladies, the duties and responsibilities of which office she assumed when twenty two years of age, and continued to discharge for a period of seventeen years until her appointment by the American Episcopal Board as a Missionary Teacher for China, which event took place in October 1843.

While in New York she was a member of St. George's Church, then under the pastoral care of Dr. Milnor, of whose ministrations she always spoke with the greatest delight. In the Sabbath Schools her labors were very earnest and greatly blessed. Of one Bible Class which she taught, all the members at length gave evidence of a change of heart.

Miss Gillette sailed for China December 14, 1844 in company with several other missionaries under the care of Bishop Boone, and arrived in Hongkong April 24, 1845.

To go forth as a missionary was to her the fulfillment of a long cherished hope. At the same time she did not forget, as no right minded woman can forget, the trials and exposures incident to such a life. Referring to her feelings at this time, she said on one occasion, many years after, with great earnestness:—"I came to China upon the 121st Psalm. Man could not support me. It was God alone. My soul went out in the words, 'My help cometh from the Lord which made heaven and earth. He will not not suffer thy foot to be moved. The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil. He shall preserve thy soul. The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in from this time forth and even forever more!'"

By her marriage to Dr. Bridgman which took place in the year 1845, her relation was transferred from the Episcopal Board to the American Board of Foreign missions, with which she remained connected until the day of her death.

The two years spent at Canton from 1845 to 1847 were chiefly useful to Mrs. Bridgman, as regarded her own efforts in the missionary work, in enabling her to begin the study of the Chinese language, and in securing two little girls as pupils, who afterward became the nucleus of the school in Shanghai. To this

latter place she removed with her husband in the year 1847.

At Shanghai their residence for five years was in a Chinese house in the densest portion of the eastern suburb of the city. Notwithstanding the prejudices of the Chinese, occasioned by ignorance and suspicion, she succeeded while there in gathering a Boarding School of girls, probably the first in Shanghai, and one of the first in China. This school she continued to superintend and instruct, with an interval of one year, 1852-1853, during her absence in returning to America, for a period of fifteen years, until 1862.

No one who knew Mrs. Bridgman need be told of her ardent zeal and abundant labors in behalf of this school. It was her one concern, the great object of her life. Nor were her labors without their reward. A good number of her pupils, became Christians, and were married to members of different churches. Almost every mission church in Shanghai has received accessions either from her pupils, or from those more or less remotely connected with them, their mothers or other friends. As her older pupils left the school, several of the more promising ones were employed by her to open day schools of girls under her own supervision. One or both of the parents were usually associated with the youthful teacher. At one time in 1859 Mrs. Bridgman had three such schools under her care, one South-east of the city of Shanghai, another in the city, and a third in a hamlet one or two miles north of her residence. Besides these schools, she had also a class of poor women who came to her for instruction upon the Sabbath, and also upon one of the week days. At that time there could scarcely have been less than seventy five women and girls who were regularly taught by her. Many among her pupils retain a lively sense of gratitude for the

labors put forth in their behalf, and some of them learned to look to her as to a mother.

The period of Mrs. Bridgman's life was one of almost uninterrupted happiness. God had given her useful employments, a comfortable measure of health, and a happy home. The death of Dr. Bridgman, which occurred in 1861 caused a great change in her circumstances. Her health gave way, and much against her own wishes, she was obliged to give up her school and return to America. This happened in 1862.

The school thus left in the height of its prosperity, and the little church connected with it, was transferred to the American Presbyterian Mission. It is gratifying to know that this school has been continued to the present time, and is now in a flourishing condition, numbering nineteen pupils, eleven of whom are members of the church. During the nine years since Mrs. Bridgman left the school, twenty five of its numbers have received Baptism, all whom are now living, and lead consistent Christian lives.

(To be continued.)

CAUSES OF HOSTILITY TO MISSIONARIES.

BY REV. J. S. BURDEN.

What are the causes of the hostility at present manifested to Missionaries in China? There is no doubt that this hostility exists. The Yanchow disturbance, the Tientsin Massacre, the Missionary Circular are all clear indications that a deep seated enmity exists, of which Missionaries seem to be the principal object. To judge by the language of the Missionary Circular, the Missionary question appears to be the one difficulty which prevents China from coming to an amicable understanding with Western Countries. How is this opposition to Christian Missions to be explained?

First I would reply that the cause is not to be found in *religious* motives. The hatred of the Chinese to Missionaries is not a religious hatred. They know nothing as yet of the "odium theologicum." It is admitted on all hands by those who know anything of this people that they are indifferent to spiritual truth. They are not exactly irreligious, but they are decidedly non-religious. Their views of life are materialistic, and it passes their comprehension that a man should make it a matter of conscience to fight either against or for a set of religious opinions. There are of course occasional exceptions to be met with, but the vast majority of the Chinese are utterly indifferent to every thing like spiritual religion. If the Chinese were fanatical Mahommedans or conscientious idolaters, the opposition to Missionaries might fairly be considered a religious one. But to talk of Confucianists and Buddhists as waging a religious crusade against Christianity on conscientious grounds is to talk sheer non-sense. As a religious system, the Confucianists simply despise it and put it on a level with Buddhism, and believers in Buddhism are generally just as ready to laugh at the impotence of an idol and the folly of idolatry as we are. We attack no sacred thing, in our sense of the word sacred, when we denounce idolatry, and we no more outrage the feelings of the people by delivering a Christian address in a Buddhist or Confucian temple than we would at home by preaching in the market place or the village green. Many of the temples are little better than markets or places of public resort, and crowds lounge every afternoon in the courtyards, ready for any one who may turn up to amuse them. If a Missionary stands up to preach in a temple courtyard while idol-worship and incense-burning are actually going on, the priest will probably be angry that his business should be interfered with, and this ought therefore to be avoided; but the idea of profanation of the temple or of the idols is one utterly foreign to them. If they are beginning to assign this as one of their grievances, it is because it

has been suggested to them by those amongst ourselves (some members of the House of Lords to wit), who not understanding the Chinese, and judging from their own religious reverence for Christian Churches and Christian Worship, attribute the like feelings to this people.

Whence then arises the opposition undoubtedly manifested to Missionaries? I account for it by the operation of three causes which have been at work for a longer or shorter period and which seem to me a sufficient explanation of all the hatred of the Chinese to Christianity and its propagators.

1.—Christianity is considered by the Chinese as a political institution, and is on this account looked upon with suspicion and dislike. Roman Catholic Missions in China have, I think, given good ground for such a suspicion. I would say, like Mr. Wade, "I am not reflecting upon Romish Missions in a sectarian spirit." I simply state a fact, patent to all men, when I say that the Tien Chu Kiau, as the system of Roman Catholic Christianity is most unfortunately named, is universally associated in the minds of the Chinese with the French Government, which has extended, to a greater or less extent, theegis of its protection over all belonging to the *Kiau*, whether Foreign or Native.

That the Foreign agents should be under the protection of their own Government is natural enough, and has never been objected to by the Chinese—publicly at least—till recently. During the last ten years however they have been drilled into the idea that they were admitted by the Tientsin Treaty into the family of nations, and finding in the course of their new education that the extraterritoriality law is not known among the nations of Christendom, they all at once discover that they are grievously injured. If the reason of that law had been kept before them as constantly as their newly acquired privilege, they perhaps would have hesitated before asking that foreign missionaries should be submitted to the tender mercies of Chinese law.

But whatever their view may be about the Foreigner and his protection, they have a perfect right to object to the application of the extraterritoriality law in any degree to their own subjects who may have become members of the Foreign religion. The attempt to introduce such an arrangement is more than enough to explain all the opposition to missions, both Protestant and Roman Catholic. Whether all the charges of Wen Siang in the missionary circular are correct may be doubted, but there is a sufficiently large substratum of truth to prove that Christianity, as presented by the Roman Catholic missionaries has been made to look very like a political institution. Roman Catholic Bishops have, according to their own statements, assumed a state and pomp which have given offence to the officers of Government, and have lowered them in the eyes of their own people. Hue himself gives us details of interferences with Magistrates in dealing with converts brought before them, and although these read amusingly to us, the effect on the Government and its agents can have been anything but amusing; no doubt converts are often most unjustly treated; charges are trumped up against them, the falsity of which it is impossible to prove, and real injustice is done which a foreign Protectorate might perhaps prevent. This, however, seems a very questionable way of propagating Christianity in a country of which Christians are not masters. I think our ministers are bound as Christians to give us all the moral help they can where they see we are right, and to show the Chinese Government that they do not regard Christianity with indifference, but it is difficult to see how any thing more can be done without creating an "imperium in imperio."

In speaking thus, I refer as much to Protestant as to Roman Catholic missions. The mention of Christianity in the Treaty and the stipulation that those who propagate it and those who profess it shall not be molested so long as they peaceably pursue their avocations, do not (to use the favourite phrase) "outrage the feelings of the

Chinese." But the active protectorate of converts by a Foreign Power while the country is governed as it is, does outrage their feelings and moreover is the very way to injure the cause of Christianity itself. If the Chinese Government began a rigorous persecution of its Christian subjects, in which thousands were either banished or put to death, it would be strange indeed if the Representatives of Christian Powers stood by silent and unmoved. This, however, is happily not our position as yet. The want of a Protectorate will no doubt cause a good deal of injustice and suffering, but its establishment would be productive of far worse evils. It would be an invitation to hypocrites to join us, it would lay us open to the charge of harbouring the very refuse of society (the very charge brought against Romish Missions by the Tsung-li Yamen), and it would involve constant political difficulties between our authorities and those of the Chinese. This is hard doctrine for our Chinese Christians, but if Christianity is to take root in China as it at first took root in the West, the Native Converts must be ready to "take joyfully the spoiling of their goods."

Political motives are the only ones that induce the Chinese Government even to meddle with what are called *Kiau* or sects. The adherents of the White Lily and other sects are diligently searched out on this ground. Christianity, by the action of the Roman Catholic missionaries, is put in the same category. It suffers, not as a religion, but because it is regarded as a political engine in the hands of Foreigners for the gradual subversion of the Government.

2.—Another reason for the dislike with which Christianity is regarded, is that it is a *foreign* institution. If the Chinese have not the "odium theologicum," they, or rather that portion of them known as the educated class, have the hatred of foreigners strongly developed. This hatred is indiscriminating. Merchant, missionary, official, each comes in for a share of it. Each is considered, as Mr. Wade well reminded the Tsung-li Yamen officers last year

no better than a "devil" or a "wild beast." All of us without exception go by the worst names among them in private, and a few of the choicest are heard wherever the power of Foreigners is not much feared. And this is not difficult of explanation. Foreigners admitted freely into the Empire represent a new state of things, their presence means change and progress, and change and progress are the things most hated and feared by those who have the governance of China in their hands. Hence the existence of these feelings towards foreigners. What is there to be done? Drive out foreigners en masse? For this they are not strong enough. Cut off the Plenipotentiaries or a few Consuls? This would inevitably lead to war with all the Western Powers, for which they hardly deem themselves yet prepared. Get up an agitation against the merchant? This is not very easy, as commerce is a thing evidently desired by the mass of the people. The missionaries, however, give fine scope for misrepresentation and agitation. So they are made the scape-goat to bear the sins of their brethren. Loud and long complaints are made against them, derived partly from fact, partly from fiction, partly from foreign writers. Disturbances are raised against them in different places to show how "the people" are opposed to them, and then the Chinese Government appeals to the Foreign Ministers against the propagation of Christianity. But all this while the real object of attack is not so much the Missionary as the Foreigner. It is hoped that by riots and massacres directed against missionaries, foreigners generally may be frightened from introducing changes, and perhaps—who knows?—may be even frightened out of the country! Hence pressure is brought to bear, as it is supposed, against foreigners by attacks on missionaries. They are spoken against, written against, and made the subject of official correspondence, but the real grievance is not that they are religious teachers, but that they are a part of that invading host of foreigners whose mission it is to introduce changes into China, and

destroy her old ideas of isolation, superiority and universal sovereignty.

All the charges that have been brought against Missionaries—those that led to the Tientsin Massacre last year, those found in that abominable book, "Death blow to corrupt Doctrines," and those connected with the Shen Sien Fen excitement of this year (1871) which nearly led to another Massacre,—are intended to apply to all Christians, and not only to the propagators of Christianity. We are all supposed to be addicted to magic and impurity, and are all alike under the ban of the Educated Class. But as foreigners generally cannot be got at, the Missionaries, as the weakest and the most exposed, have to bear the brunt of all the hatred felt by the Chinese literati towards foreigners.

3.—A third reason, which I have no hesitation in assigning for the strong opposition now manifested to Missions, is the aspect of our own high officers before the Chinese Government with reference to Missionaries and their work. The opinions of our late Minister on the subject of Missions are well known. Sir Rutherford Alcock seemed to think that Opium and Missions were the two disturbing elements in our intercourse with China, and if the report of an incident, said to have taken place during his farewell visit to Prince Kung, is correct, he made no secret of his views to the Chinese. The Prince, it is said, thanked the British Minister for raising the tax on the importation of opium, "and now," he added, "if you could only put a check on the importation of Missionaries, China would be eternally your debtor." Prince Kung must have well understood the mind of the Representative of Great Britain, before he would have ventured to make such a request even in jest. One cannot wonder at the issue of the Missionary Circular after intercourse such as this? The only wonder is that it was not issued earlier.

But even when our officials have been personally in favour of Christian Missions, the mode of dealing with cases brought up for discussion or decision has been such as to produce the

same result. Anti-missionary sentiments are mischievous, because they give the Chinese an opportunity of complaint against one class of Foreigners which they will try to improve against all Foreigners, but a timid policy in dealing with plain cases of injustice in connection with Missionaries is just as mischievous. Both equally convey the idea to the Chinese Government that our Officials are as anxious to keep Missionaries out of China as they are, and when this idea enters their minds to however small an extent, it is natural that they should make the most of it, and raise a hue and cry against those who are supposed to be an element of difficulty and danger by Foreigners themselves.

The opposition then to Missionaries is founded, not on the nature of Christianity as a religion for China, but on accidental circumstances arising partly from the fault of those representing Christianity, and partly from the Anti-foreign character of the Chinese mind. To join in the Chinese Government cry against Christianity and its propagators is merely to retard the solution of the question of foreign intercourse with China.

As for the residence of Missionaries in the Interior, it ought to be remembered that in the early years of the Tientsin Treaty no one doubted that if a residence could be secured in any place away from a Port without the opposition of the local Magistrates, the Treaty would not be broken by Missionaries thus settling themselves. No word of protest was issued by our Authorities on the subject and the consequence is that many places have been occupied already. It is therefore now too late to lay down a law that it shall not be done. The course pursued by the American Minister seems to me by far the best—to lay down no law whatever on the subject. American Missionaries may go about the Country with their passports as much as they please and settle themselves where they can do so quietly. Nothing is done to compel the people to rent houses to them, and if they are baffled in their attempts to secure a residence, they retire. But

it any of them were to be injured, I have no doubt that the Minister would do all in his power to obtain redress or to give protection. He might not be able to effect much in this way; for moral means, according to Sir Rutherford Alcock, are of little avail with this Government, but the very fact the Minister does not regard the Missionaries as doing a lawless thing in settling in the Interior is a gain on the side of the Missionary. The Missionary accepts the risk, and has the satisfaction of knowing that his Minister does not consider him an outlaw.

PEKING, Nov. 9, 1871.

PROCLAMATION FORBIDDING IDOL PROCESSIONS.

BY H. M. C. S.

A Proclamation issued by Wen Acting Governor General of Fokien, and Wang Lieutenant Governor.

This Proclamation is to remind every one that religious processions and meetings are offences that have long been proscribed, and that if the officials fail to put a stop to such proceedings they will be held guilty of a misdemeanour. The first essential is that each man should strive to do his best in whatever state of life he may be placed, and even if such beings as good and evil spirits exist, they should be regarded with distant awe.

Now the natives of this Province are particularly prone to a superstitious belief in good and bad spirits, and knaves and rascals aware of this propensity obtain money by means of pretending to get up some festival or other. In addition to this there are the ceremonies called the "Chien Tien" (Secluded Halls) and the T'a-hu (Pagoda Frame) and others with similar extraordinary names, which have been frequently interdicted without much effect.

Again: plays are acted at night in the Buddhist Temples. There are too many small shrines by the road side. Invocatory sentences are hung on doors. Irregular means are used to cure dis-

eases. Magic is employed to take the populace in. Incantations are used to devise the death of others. Now all these proceedings are illegal, and are besides offences of a hateful description.

The following stringent regulations are hereby laid down. If any one disobeys them, or if the local authorities do not take care that they are observed, severe punishment without mercy shall follow. We have spoken and the law shall take its course. Let every one tremble.

Regulation 1.—It is forbidden to assemble crowds for religious processions, or to pretend to get up the ceremonies called the "Asking for Aid," or the "Driving out to Sea" &c., or the "Dragon Boat" festival, with a view to make money by it.

Certain rites used to be held in country places with the object of expelling pestilential influences. The intention is innocent enough, but what is the meaning of having idols carried along the road? That men should go so far as to make an idol, and carry it to a certain place, and offer it wine and food, as if asking it to partake of a feast, is as ludicrous as it is offensive. Again, although the lesser religious services are not to be compared to these festivals and processions, and a short ceremony may be permitted, yet nothing extravagant can be allowed, nor is there to be any illumination for fear of fire, as happened this year at the Temple of the Three Kings, and at the Shanse and Shense Club,—which should be a warning to you.

Regulation 2.—It is forbidden to have a religious procession to any house, under the pretence of curing sickness, as such a proceeding tends to alarm the neighbourhood.

Sickness is a common calamity. How can any one be so presumptuous as to move an image of a god for his own benefit? If such things as the spirits of these gods exist, they must feel deeply insulted, and will not fail to inflict some extra punishment.

Regulation 3.—It is forbidden to erect small shrines at the wayside, whereat to worship the local divinities.

This refers to the construction of "Halls for male spirits," "Homes for female ghosts," temples for the "Giant and the Dwarf," and such like notorious practices. That care should be taken to look after these various shrines is strange indeed.

Regulation 4.—It is forbidden to paste placards up along the streets declaring that such and such a place is the promenade or the abode of a certain god.

As for instance "The promenade of the eldest son of Duke Weiling" or of General Ma, or of Tartar General Wên, just as if a coolie's abode could be the abode of a noble.

Regulation 5.—It is forbidden to dress up as the "Giant and the Dwarf."

The name of the Giant is, "Be thankful and you shall have peace;" that of the Dwarf "Offend and you shall not be saved." Such sayings are so utterly senseless that their use should be discontinued.

Regulation 6.—It is forbidden to put on the disguise of a criminal [as a religious devotee].

This practice used formerly to prevail among children only, but now it is greatly in vogue among full grown men. These go so far as to allow their hair to remain unshorn, and to wear the red garments of condemned criminals, with similar improper practices. This is excessively reprehensible.

Regulation 7.—You are forbidden to hold theatrical performances at night in temples.

Not only does this practice offer opportunities to create a disturbance and cause danger of fire, but it is also a wasteful and extravagant proceeding.

Regulation 8.—You are forbidden, such of you as are not Buddhist or Taoist Priests to practice incantations to call down spirits.

How can even the priests do this, and if they cannot, it would be a silly story to say the common people can succeed.

Regulation 9.—You are forbidden, if you have a grudge against any one to practice the magic called "Striking the Bull's Head."

That is to say,—Writing a man's name and age and so forth on a scrap of paper, and laying it before the bull-

headed idol, and then buying an iron stamp, and piercing small holes in this paper, and finally throwing it at a man on the sly with the intention of compassing his death.

Regulation 10.—Young women are forbidden to go into the temples to offer incense and worship.

The practice of offering flowers to get children &c. is a very immodest one.

TUNG-CHIH, 10th year, 11th Month 21st day.

[January, 1st 1872.]

INDISCRETIONS OF DIPLOMATISTS.

BY BOOMERANG.

A Traveller on a Russian highway in the rigor of winter is sometimes startled by having his nose rubbed roughly with a handful of snow by some one a wanderer like himself whom he happens to confront. If this were of the nature of a "tweak," by all mankind alike deemed offensive, it would speedily be resented. But when he considers, that, unconsciously to himself, his nose is being bitten by the frost, and the design of the rubbing is to stimulate the torpid circulation, he comes to regard it as a friendly act, all the more praise-worthy by its coming from a total stranger whom he has never met before and may never see again. The Missionaries may have stood in need of such attentions. If so, they have no reason to complain of neglect; they have received them in profusion. They themselves, and their plans of labor, have been criticised with layish frankness and cordiality. But it is possible, others besides missionaries may be in the condition of the unfortunate traveller. To them also an extension of those roadside courtesies would not be amiss. Nor is there any reason why some should be excepted whose organs present an appearance blue and benumbed by protracted sessions in the cold and comfortless Yammuns of Peking. The propounders of those criticisms would feel themselves aggrieved if any other than the most generous aims were attributed to them. Granting them all they ask for them-

selves they will be prompt to concede as much to others in return. Conscious of candor in their own bosoms, they will instinctively attribute candor and fairness to their neighbors. Their sensibilities will not be wounded by accepting the kindly service it has given them so much pleasure to render. It has been said, the animadversions heaped upon missionaries, even though not always sustained by facts, will nevertheless have a good effect by teaching them carefully to ponder their ways. A treatment so invariably healthful should not be restricted to the few; but should extend its benefits to all classes alike. Should the opinions of missionaries on subjects outside their own special department betray a deficiency of perception they themselves will still hope to escape severe censure from those whose flagrant mistakes of a similar kind will have prepared them to exercise lenience and forbearance. Admitting freely that we ourselves are but learners, and that in a difficult school, it will at the same time not be presumptuous to enquire whether certain high diplomatic officials have always displayed wisdom sufficiently unerring to enable them to condemn the indiscretions of others without embarrassment to themselves.

In whatever direction the inquiry is pursued the supply of material is abundant. There have been failures to apprehend the political movements of the Chinese; foreign prestige has been sacrificed to an unwise expediency; the "Pressure" question has been misrepresented; the relations of Centralism and Provincialism have been confused; and suicidal ideas of progress have been followed.

A wise general before making his own plan of a campaign will ascertain whether a given demonstration by the foe is simulate or real. A shrewd parliamentarian, when presenting a bill, will not, if he can present it, allow an opponent to tack on an offensive amendment for the purpose of killing it. In tactics that demand this kind of precaution in us the Chinese are adepts. In putting forward suppositions issues their skill is consummate. Novitiates in state

craft might be excused for occasionally falling into a snare; but those who have passed through all the grades, and have been a quarter of a century in diplomatic service, are expected to have an adequate stock of experience and to know how to profit by it. Yet of late years we have seen heads of bureaus, and statesmen distinguished for their abilities made the victims of Chinese artifice to an extent never before heard of. *The Burlingame Embassy* is now conceded on all sides to have been an imposition on Western Cabinets making treaties with them by hypothecating good intentions which never existed. Mr. Burlingame and Mr. Hart supposed that they themselves at least knew the road they were travelling, but the result has shown they too were groping in a thicket and leading those cabinets to the edge of the ditch into which they since have fallen. William H. Seward was misled; the Earl of Clarendon was misled; the envoys at Peking were misled, and none of them more egregiously than Sir Rutherford Alcock who has felt it his duty to be especially severe upon the short sightedness of other men whether Merchants or Missionaries or Consuls. *The missionary question* was an interpolated issue and not the real one which was the exclusion of all foreigners from inland residence. Sir Rutherford failed to discover that also, and by his hasty indorsement of Chinese statements sacrificed the opportunity he had to render to the merchants a signal service in that direction. *The Mandarin representation that the Tientsin Massacre was wholly a consequence of an improvised street mob* was another fraud upon public faith. The community were not deceived, but again were the envoys misled. Of all classes of foreign residents, some of them were the slowest to recognise the deep and dangerous significance of that outbreak. Mr. Wade was under illusion for months. At the outset he combatted the opinion of a subordinate imputing complicity to the Officials. Subsequently he was constrained to admit what the journals of Shanghai and Hongkong had been affirming for a whole summer. He says, "If Chung Ho was so well informed

[ten days before] it is vain to suppose the Central Government was left in ignorance." And yet once more *the assertion in the Missionary Circular that trade had occasioned no difference between China and the Western powers* was made in bare-faced contradiction to the records of forty years. Then why was the blood-shed of two successive wars? And what is the purport of volumes of correspondence piled up among Government Archives? And why all those complaints about transit dues and le-kim taxes? And what is the meaning of Tseng Kuo Fan's memorial? And why then does the Tsung Li Yamun persist in refusing Merchants access to the interior? Yet this statement also has been accepted in high official quarters as an honest expression of Chinese sentiment, and not discerned in its true character of an adroit manœuvre to enlist the merchants in a crusade against their own extritoriality by assailing nominally the extritoriality of missionaries.

Such failures in perception become the gravest of diplomatic mistakes. By having attention directed to a false issue the true one is lost sight of. Opportunity is given to wily opponents to organise opposition without being suspected. When at length the real drift of a movement is disclosed, the Envoys are unprepared to meet it to advantage, or can do so only by nullifying their former declarations. If the United States should be desirous of enlarging their sphere of trade in China they could do it only, by first repudiating their own concessions in the farcical treaty of Washington, or by "waiting around," outside the gateway of the favored nation clause, until the door should be pryed open by some other power not hampered by ill digested disclaimers, made in haste and repented of at leisure. The last Message of Pres. Grant is suggestively silent on Chinese affairs.

Next it may be asked. Has there been a wise administration of that effective influence called Prestige which constitutes the adumbration of national greatness? It includes both a moral and a material element. Moral prestige is the

reputation gained by integrity and firmness in diplomacy: Material prestige is the influence acquired by prowess in the field. It is to a nation, as the *Daily Press* has observed, what credit is to a banker: it enables him to negotiate large transactions without the incessant exhibit of coin. It is what renown is to a warrior: it enables him to overawe contumelious districts without the perpetual tramp of heavy battalions. England's prestige in China has hitherto surpassed that of her Sister nations, for it has been her fortune to lead the van. There have been some things attending its acquisition which her own people regret but there are other things which challenge the admiration of all her compeers. It constitutes her noblest possession in the East. It is equivalent to a fleet and an army; for it continues to discharge the office of both, after armies and fleets are withdrawn. As the fruit of this prestige we have seen the foreigner treated with respect. His interests are seldom trifled with wantonly. In the midst of popular anarchy he has passed with safety where a native would have imperilled his life. In times of civil upheaval, his settlements have been crowded with those who could trust his magnanimity more freely than they could the honor of their own soldiers sent for their protection. The word of his Consuls too has been with power. Their despatches have received consideration, not always prompt it is true, nor yet satisfactory, but, let it not be forgotten, with more deferential respect than is usually accorded to similar papers among themselves.

But this prestige has passed under a cloud of late, the direct result of the mode adopted to supply strength to the Administrative organism of China. It would be noble in a wealthy banker to lend money to a tottering firm to keep it on its feet. It is not necessary to supplement generosity by an act of folly, by borrowing in public that which was lent in private but a day before. Such a course would indeed strengthen the doubtful firm but it would be done at the expense of the good standing as well as the cost of the established

one. The poverty of the weaker compelling it to seek support, is entitled to commiseration; but the pride that would ask a friend to appear to be a debtor when he is really a creditor has no claim to indulgence, and should not be flattered when it ought to be rebuked. The diplomatic policy since the rebellion started on the generous principle of bolstering up the Central Government to enable it to meet its engagements, but it has degenerated into a seeming transfer to the Imperial Authorities of the prestige of thirty years accumulation. Our safety in China to-day is due to the memory of the past more than to either the willingness or the ability of the Central Government to protect us. Yet it has been studiously made to appear that we receive it as a gracious boon from Imperial hands, while the real conditions of safety are stigmatised as relics of barbarism of the times when Lord Palmerston was Premier of England. The hostile classes of China have noticed the change. They have read the instructions to gunboats to be ready to receive refugees in case of an out-break. Uneducated, as yet, to the observance of treaties apart from the stimulus of fear, and not apprehending the boldness of the venture made upon the good faith of their sovereign, they have construed all this into an implied admission of foreign decay. They have concluded their own Dynasty has grown vastly more powerful and foreigners have become correspondingly weaker. Following this has been the resuscitation of old animosities supposed to have been smothered. That the Dynasty should strengthen itself is to be desired alike by natives and foreigners, but it may well be asked, whether it has been wise to strengthen it not so much *absolutely*, by insisting upon reforms, as *relatively*, by appearing to become timid and weak ourselves.

As a part of this policy, distorted views of what is called the Pressure question have come in to increase the confusion. On this the views of the mass of the foreign community have been misconceived and misstated. There has been a failure to discriminate be-

tween pressure to compel the observance of treaties, which is right, and pressure to extort new concessions, which is wrong, and this distinction has been frequently lost sight of in official discussions and still more in practical measures in the past four years. If this article were conceived in other than the best interests of peace it would be strangely out of place in the columns of a *Missionary Journal*. But it will not be conceded that those persons are necessarily, the best conservators of peace who claim to be such. Without the least impeachment of the purity and generosity of their motives it must be affirmed, there are peace men whose policy generates war: and there are also war men whose policy perpetuates the peace. The tranquillity of recent years is the fruit of vigor and decision in times gone by, when Sir Henry Pottinger and Lord Elgin gave tone to diplomacy. The speck of war cloud that has gathered of late has been the result of hesitating and backward steps, tempting the Chinese as Mr. Hart has intimated, to strike the neck that bends. Mr. Wade is understood to have favored the withdrawal of the gunboats trusting for protection entirely to the good faith of the Chinese. Yet in contravention of his whole argument he frankly states that had a gunboat been at Tientsin the massacre might never have occurred. It is to be noted further that the partial satisfaction tardily received for that outrage, was rendered only when temporizing language concerning the *Amour propre* of the Chinese was discarded and a return was threatened to the means by which, the world over, evil doers are compelled to pay respect to the requirements of law and good government. Assuredly there is something strikingly analagous to "indiscretion" in the ready condemnation of the only men who have made a residence in China safe for us all:—in the repudiation of our own means of protection; and in the sudden casting of ourselves upon the good faith of a government in which *treachery* is an accepted mode of administering the affairs of the State. Happily the recent words of Lord Granville have come in

to throttle the mischief the Missionary Circular was fitted to produce. Had Sir Rutherford Alcock expressed similar views during his "two hours" conferences with the Cabinet ministers, instead of avowing, as he did the readiness of the British Government to restrict Protestant Missionaries but which would be of no avail until something should be done to restrict the French Roman Catholics, Lord Granville's solicitude would have been prevented, for the circular itself would never have been written. Far better would it have been if, instead of unsuitable condoling, the Envoy had told the Chinese authorities honestly and boldly, that the presence here of an armed force was rendered necessary by their own bad faith or incompetence; that it was not the wish of Western Governments to insist forever upon extraterritoriality; that when China would truthfully and honestly exercise her sovereignty in conformity to the laws of nations, and discord thumb screws, scourgings, and other tortures in conducting her judicial inquiries, then foreign governments could trust their subjects in her hands, and "the inevitable gunboat,"—so offensive to their sensitive pride,—would be left to rot in ordinary at home, or be sent far away to teach order and decorum to the Cannibals of the South Sea Islands.

Another mistake is seen in discussing the conditions of progress. China is weak, morally as well as materially. Science and Commerce come in to supply her material wants. It is an office of Christianity to develop the conscience, without which, power is a dangerous possession. But certain diplomatists have told the world, that Christianity is introducing explosive elements. The honesty of their opinions is not called in question. But what do they propose in its stead? They or others with their approbation, are instructing the Chinese in the art of building gunboats. They are teaching them to organize armies. They are training them for the duties of the camp. Americans, Englishmen, Frenchmen and Germans are competing with each other in rendering them formidable foes in battle. They are providing them with improved and destruc-

tive munitions of war. They are fostering in them the hope of some day being able to rout the hated foreigner on the field of strife. All this is being done by diplomatic sanction and is declared to be real and cheering progress. It is affirmed that missionaries are the chief obstacles in the way of advancement, the fact being lost sight of all the while, that there are such things in China as antipathies of races, antagonisms of civilizations and jealousies of nations. "*China is to be made strong*," has been the first political maxim of the last five years. There has been no solicitude that she should be made upright at the same time. No precautions have been taken to prevent this increase and consolidation of power being used against us. No guarantees have been demanded. With a blindness to possible contingencies absolutely amazing, men have urged forward the work of making China "*Strong*,"—no one pausing to consider what may be the issue of it all. No caution is suggested to them by the Sepoy rebellion; none by the mutiny at Carete; none by the outbreak at Tientsin with the express connivance of foreign drilled troops.

And while this is being done in one quarter a hitherto effectual preventive of evil is being broken down in another. Too great concentration of power is at variance with the enlightened sentiment of mankind. In England this is prevented by the separation of the Legislative, the Judicial, and the Executive functions; in the United States by the same separation and by a further division into General and State Governments. In China the three functions are combined in one individual being possessed, within certain limits, by Viceroys and even by Tau-Tais. But a compensation is found in the distribution of power between the Central and the Provincial Authorities. A combination of the two is the normal mode of Civil administration. A fortunate thing it has been for foreigners in their past collisions. In England or America, a parallel to what was seen in China during two successive wars could not exist. In the former, a blow at any point would break up all inter-

course and mobilize retaliation from Lands End to John O Groats, and from the pines of Maine to the lagoons of Louisiana. In China, the state of things has allowed dealing with Provinces in detail. And to us it seems not only fortunate for foreigners but humane for the people of China as well; for it admits of the localization of trouble instead of its general diffusion. Mr. Burlingame represented that Western Cabinets must choose "Centralism or Provincialism," whereas it should be Centralism AND Provincialism. Settling Provincial difficulties with Provincial Authorities according to the genius of Chinese usage without involving innocent parties elsewhere, was stigmatized as "making war on China." Whereas under Mr. Burlingame's plan, a localization of any particular difficulty is no longer possible. If redress is refused or neglected its prosecution must be dropped or obtained only by making war and entailing untold misery on a whole empire for what has been done in some villainous locality, as Tientsin for example. To many observers of Chinese politics it would seem the wiser and more beneficent course to maintain unaltered the present balance existing between the Central and Provincial Authorities. The former should be strengthened but so likewise should the latter, *in relative proportion*. Least of all should the former be strengthened at the expense of the revenue and prerogatives of the Provincials. Yet we have seen this process going on; and perhaps the fact may serve to account for some of the hostility manifested by Viceroys and by influential classes in the Provinces, while, consistently enough, the Imperial Court is declared to be satisfied with existing arrangements. But whether this be correct or not, we may yet have to inquire what will be the conditions of safety in this land when all its financial and military resources, instead of being distributed among many separate and partially independent Viceroys as they now are, shall become concentrated in a single Yamun, ready to be wielded in any given direction at the behest of a single will. There is supposed to be an advantage

in this, even for foreigners. It simplifies diplomacy and economizes consular force. So it does; but there is a disadvantage as well. It is not equally certain to economize military force by and bye.

Gathering up the particulars, what a spectacle of confusion and blundering presents itself. It is doubtful whether the diplomatic records of any other four years in history furnish a parallel. An American Minister deserts the service of his country, and enters on a mission detrimental to the interests of his countrymen he came to assist. Nurtured in Republican respect for State's rights, he nevertheless enters upon a policy intended to cripple provincial rights. Educated in a distrust of too much centralization of power, he nevertheless lends his energies to disturb existing relations and build up a consolidated despotism at Peking. Himself the victim of a delusion, he goes home to spread the delusion over others. He leads his Government to make a treaty which is at once interposed as a barrier to the advancing tide of civilization. A British Embassy presents the appearance of a house divided against itself. The Minister first lauds the Embassy and then decries it. His principal Secretary is absent from his post, and unconsciously is thwarting the wishes of his chief. Another Secretary is engaged openly in the service of the enemy. The Envoy himself remains behind weakhanded, endeavoring to negotiate a treaty. Baffled by the movements of so called allies who are aided by his own subordinates, he makes a pitiable failure. The old potent prestige has lost its charm. What little he does achieve is effected in part by calling in the aid of an agent of the Chinese Government, and is found so unsatisfactory that it goes down before the storm raised by the indignant merchants. A son of the Queen is allowed to be placed in a position where an appearance of slight can be cast upon him. A golden opportunity for settling the Audience question is permitted to pass unimproved, and if rumor speaks aright will fall to another nation than the one to whom the honor nat-

urally appertained. Confused and contradictory orders are issued about gunboats. America is allowed to be played off against England, and England in turn against France. Envoys deem it their duty to discourage missionary operations, but see no danger in the employment of drill masters to teach the Chinese how to fight. The dissemination of Christian tracts is regarded as inimical to friendly intercourse, but rifles and gunpowder, sold to the Chinese, are supposed to be guarantees of peace and brotherly love. As a result of all this, we see suppressed antipathies reasserting themselves; and measures taken to nationalize a rancor once only provincial. We see the Chinese emboldened by the vacillation of foreign Governments, which they have mistaken for pusillanimity, begin a repudiation of treaty concessions. And we have seen them inaugurate a series of outrages which had nearly caused the disruption of friendly relations and the precipitation of war. Compared with those continuous and gigantic follies the petty "indiscretions" attributed to missionaries, are exalted to the respectability of WISDOM.

FENG SHUI.

The wind and water superstition of the Chinese.

BY REV. J. EDKINS.

Every thing can be made plainer by investigation. Every thing can be understood better by the bringing together of facts. The Feng-shui of the Chinese deserves to be examined for it is one of the great obstacles to the progress of civilization.

It interferes with commercial enterprise. It checks the efforts of missionary zeal. It interrupts the free thought of the people and keeps them wrapped in the mummy folds of ancient prejudices.

Within the last few years this peculiar system of native geomancy has been made the ground for refusing the establishment of the electric tele-

graph at Shanghai; of railways; of a road from Tientsin to the Chaitang coal mines, and of I do not know how many more manifest and desirable improvements, all which would be of the greatest advantage to the people of the district. I begin with the explanation of terms. *Feng* wind is the first which occurs. It may be illustrated in this way.

A grave should not have a hollow near it. The wind will blow into the grave from that hollow and gradually disturb the bones and the coffin. In ten years they will be half turned over. In twenty years or so they may be entirely turned over. In that case the posterity of the dead will suffer by a kind of material necessity. Such a wind is called a *Wa-feng* from *Wa* hollow. An outer wind must not be allowed to invade the chamber of the dead, for fear the family fortunes should be disturbed. Thus the filial piety which takes care of the tombs of parents has a material reward and may be nothing beyond a course selfishness; on the other hand the want of it is invited by a natural retribution involving sickness, poverty, loss of descendants, and degradation in the social scale.

The aim of the geomancer is to find a spot where the *feng*, the *cold air which issues from the earth* is hidden. This they call *T'sang-feng*. Where there are no hollows it is safe to dig the grave, for here there is no outlet by which this pernicious wind may disturb the dead.

The second term to be explained is water 水 *Shui*. The grave must be carefully chosen. The configuration of the earth is caused by the dragon whose shape is seen in the mountain boundary cast upon the evening sky. The dragon may be traced to its source. It is observable in the flow of the mountain stream, or in the contour of the earth. The hollow river bed, and the variety of hill and valley are caused by the dragon.

Trace the water of a valley to its source. That is the point from which commences the influence that controls human destiny. Water is the element in which the dragon delights. Its winding shape as it meanders through a plain gives evidence of this, for the dragon prefers crooked paths. Since then the dragon gives prosperity, elevates the king and the sage, and is the symbol of all exaltation, social, political or moral, it is all important to consider the position of water when selecting the site of the grave. In the valley of the Ming tombs the water flows from the North-west, passes under a bridge in front of the grave of the Emperor Yung-lo, and then pursues its way down towards the plain of Peking on the south east. Hills in horse shoe form embrace the valley. The *Feng-shui* is good.

If the water flows past a certain point of the geomancer's compass it causes prosperity; at another it brings misfortune. If, for instance, to be more particular in detail, the branching point of water be at the N.E., N.W., S.E. or S.W. points of the compass it is possible that there may be prosperity. If it be at the E.N.E., W.S.W., S.S.E., N.N.W., the elder sons and brothers of the deceased will become scattered and poor. Water at the E. by N., W. by S., S. by E., N. by W. points, will ensure happiness to his children they not being the eldest or youngest. The same children will suffer misfortune if water flow past the N. by E. and W. points.

The chief use of the geomancer's compass is to determine in regard to the water, the direction of flow, the primary source, the points of junction, and the points from which it starts afresh at a new angle. The grave must be chosen so that the presaged fate as fixed by the manual of geomancy may be of the most favourable kind.

The cutting of a new road would alter the course of water and in various ways affect the calculation of the geomancer, and as the graves of the past generation are found everywhere, there is no spot where the minds of the people will not be disturbed by projects involving the construction of roads. If the mistake in the selection of a grave site leads to poverty, sudden death, and other calamities, may not a railway cutting or any disturbance in the course of streams be equally deleterious? The faith in Feng-shui must be first eradicated before the Chinese can be induced to look with favour on railways or any description of new roads. If the government should consent to such improvements, their action ought to be accompanied by edicts and publications authoritatively condemning the superstition, and showing what solid reasons there are for disbelieving the whole system of the geomancers. This would aid greatly in soothing the minds of the hostile and calming the fears of the ignorant.

But to proceed, the water before a tomb must be running water. Riches and rank flow like water capriciously from one point to another. Hence riches and rank are supposed to depend on the undisturbed flow of the stream which passes under the bridge in front of the tomb. Man inhabits the tomb and his destiny is affected by the surrounding circumstances. Riches and rank are attached to flowing water, and if due care is taken by the geomancer and by the posterity of the dead, a perpetual stream of worldly honour and wealth may be expected to flow into the possession of the family.

It may be instructive to dwell for a moment on this superstition, proving as it does, that the same dense cloud of ignorance rests on China as upon Europe before it was illumined by the sun of Christianity. On the

geomancer's compass the twelve cyclic characters 子 丑 Tsü 'cheu, yin &c. are inscribed at equal distances interspersed with other cycles. The first Tsü begins at the north point is at the back of the tomb which faces the south. The order of the words is from east to west according to the diurnal motion of the sun and stars. Let the observer imagine himself standing at the back of one of those common tombs which are protected on the north side* by a long curved bank overgrown with grass. Behind him on the horizon is Tsü, next on the left is 'cheu and so on to the south point Wu. If there is a bend in the course of the water or a junction of two streams on the north at Tsü, the posterity of the occupant of the grave will be thieves if poor, and robbed if rich. If on the north east they will die young, and be left as widows and men without children. At the third division they will be greatly subject to diseases. If the geomancer notices that the bend is in the east point of the horizon, he will be bound to foretell that the posterity of the dead will be vagabonds. At the next two stations the special evils indicated are disobedience and rebellion at the one and at the other the consequence will be that a snake will grow of itself in the tomb. This is a very bad sign and presages restlessness for the bones of the dead and the fortunes of the living. It brings the evil wind of unhappy destiny with special force upon the occupier of the tomb. The south indicates that the descendants of the dead will lead licentious lives. Here I stop; but the geomancer does not rest till he has boxed the compass with a variety of evils supposed to befall the possessor of an ill chosen site for his grave. Such a system is well adapted to increase the authority of the

* In Southern China this bank is carried around the N.E. and W. sides.

Feng-shui-sien-sheng or geomancer. He must be well skilled in all the indications which the traditions and books of his profession single out as of importance.

These deceivers of their fellow men who make their living by practising on the superstitious tendencies of their patrons, are sometimes waiting in care for their reputation. They often carry the thing too far. They are held up to ridicule not uncommonly by the people, and especially because the word *Feng* wind is also identical in sound with *Feng* lunatic. The country people ridicule them as they stand on the grave site to make observations, or creep on the ground, or sit on their thighs or superintend the erection of a mound of grass clods or come out at evening with a lanthorn to set on the mount as an assistance to them in considering at a distance the desirable or unfavourable features of the site in question.

Very like is all this to the astrology of the Chaldeans, that system of magic and fortune telling against which Christianity had to fight in the days of Hippolytus and Origen. The one applied the cycles of astronomy to divination with the object of making gain by telling fortunes. The other makes use of the same cycles in geomancy to obtain money by foretelling evil and coaxing a good destiny upon him who pays the conjuror. He will become the most popular and best esteemed geomancer who makes the most cunning observations on the contour of the country and the arrangement of the streams of water at the spot where the grave is, or where it is intended to be made. (*To be continued.*)

MEMOIR OF A NATIVE CHRISTIAN.

BY REV WM. MUIRHEAD.

On the fall of Nankin into the hands of the rebels, a multitude of refugees

came to Shanghai. Among them there was one named Chang-ju-yung, who had been engaged in the silk trade. His family was scattered like many others in those trying times, and he felt himself very much alone in the world. He was in the habit of going to the London Mission chapel in the city, where in the course of the services, the troubles of the day were often adverted to. In harmony with the Chinese sentiment at least, these were spoken of as the Will of Heaven or as the judgment of God. Our friend was much struck with the idea, and was led to think that unless the nation had deserved these calamities, they would never have been inflicted. Step by step he was brought to apprehend the truth as to human sinfulness, and following upon it the great fact of redemption by our Lord Jesus Christ. His manner and bearing were very satisfactory, and in due time he was baptized. He remained in Shanghai for several years, manifesting a consistent course of conduct, and impressing all with a sense of the honesty and truthfulness of his life and character.

When Hankow was opened to foreign trade, it was resolved to commence a Mission there, and Mr. Chang was asked to accompany several brethren, native and foreign, to that place. He did good service while residing in that important city, and was held in high esteem by all who knew him.

As he was advancing in years, he was anxious to return to Shanghai, in the hope of meeting some of his friends, and hearing about his only son who had been separated from him by the rebellion. This latter object was not destined to be accomplished for a long time afterwards, when happily the young man came to the place in the search for his father. On arriving here, Mr. Chang was appointed door keeper of our largest city chapel. From the first his conduct in that capacity, and as a deacon of the church, gave much satisfaction. His age gained for him respect and honour, and his whole deportment was in accordance with his Christian profession. He was most trustworthy in whatever was commit-

ed to his care, and faithful and earnest in his conversation with many who came into the chapel. Though not a great scholar, he could read very well, and was a diligent student of the Scriptures, Pilgrim's Progress and similar books prepared for the native Christians. He was thus enabled to speak to others about Divine things in an intelligent manner, and we have often listened to his urgent appeals to them to renounce the idolatrous practices of the age, and accept the gospel, as their highest interest and duty. In the course of his addresses, he frequently described his own past history, when accustomed to repair to the temples, from which however, he said, he never obtained the slightest good, but that he found rest and peace only on coming to Christ.

At length the time of our friend's departure drew high. In November last he was seized with a kind of partial paralysis which did not affect his consciousness. He recovered from it in some degree, but it left him so weak, that he was unable to attend to the duties of his office. He went to his son's house where he lay down to die. Hearing that he was ill, the writer called to see him. At first I could only express my sympathy with him, and hope that he would soon get better. He thanked me very warmly, and asked me to remember him in prayer. The next day he was evidently much worse, and on inquiring how he was, he replied, "I am happy, happy." How was this? I asked. He said that "he knew in his heart that Jesus was calling him home." "But have you no fear in your mind about it?" "Oh no. For many years I have had the assurance in my heart that Jesus was my Saviour, and He has taken all my fear and sorrow away." But are you not a sinner, and what then? "Yes, my sins are many, very many, but Jesus has washed them away in his blood, and therefore I am at peace." "Do you feel that Jesus is with you now?" "Yes: He is, and is making me glad." "Is He precious to you?" "Very precious" was his emphatic reply. I then quoted several passages of Scripture, such as the promise of Christ in John 14. 2, to which

he readily assented. On asking if he had anything in his mind that he would like to tell me, he said his only concern was about his son, who was then supporting him in bed. He wanted him to believe in Jesus, and by and bye they would meet together in heaven. The son was deeply effected by the remark, and I took advantage of it to press upon him the duty of following his father's steps. In the course of the conversation, I said that if Jesus were soon to call him away, what as to the arrangements at the funeral? Did he wish any of the idolatrous customs of the country to be observed? His answer was expressed in the strongest terms. "No, no, no. They are all empty and vain. I have done with them. Whether I get well or not, I have given up all that kind of thing," and after taking breath for a little, he cried in a most striking manner,—"I have overcome the world." He was asked if it was through believing in Jesus this was done? He could only say in reply, "yes, yes."

On visiting him again, I found him very weak, and on inquiring how he felt, he answered that he was "in great darkness." I exhorted him to trust in Jesus, and that he would be with him. "But will Jesus really accept me?" "Has he not promised," I said, "that him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out?" "Do you not remember his words?" "Yes, I do." "And have you not come to him in your heart?" "Yes, I have, but may he not make a difference by accepting some and rejecting me?" "Oh no, dear friend" was my reply. He says "whosoever believeth in me," and leaving him to fill up the clause, he added, "everlasting life." I told him he was then very weak, and these doubts and fears often come over God's people in their last hours. "Could he not call to mind 'Pilgrim' as he was crossing the river of death, how distressed he was but did that affect his safety?" "No, it did not," he said. "So, my friend, it is with you. Jesus is at hand, He will help you all the way through the dark valley, and bring you safely to the other side." I spoke to him of David's

experience in the 23rd Psalm, and of the great multitude before the throne whom he was so soon to join, and asked him if the prospect of it did not make him happy? "Yes" he replied. "Would he not ascribe his salvation to God and the Lamb as they did?" "It was to Him alone," he said "that he owed it all." "Have you any merit or good work of your own that you can depend on, as a ground of acceptance with God?" "Not in the least, I am a sinner all over: I trust simply to the merits of Jesus and his precious blood which was shed for me." I then bade him farewell, not expecting to see him again, and told him that he was only preceding his Christian friends on the way home and that ere long they would be with him in Heaven. He had strength to add "happy, happy." These were about his last words. That same evening, on the 6th January 1872, he quietly ceased to breathe, and his redeemed spirit took its flight to the world above.

I am glad to be able to say that the native Pastor, an experienced Christian of seventeen years standing, listened to many gratifying statements of the same kind from the lips of our departed friend.

CONNECTION OF CHINESE AND HEBREW.

IX Paper: 1st Part.

BY REV. J. EDKINS.

Grounds for the restoration of these lost letters.

1. The most obvious reason for restoring final K or T or P to Chinese words which have lost it, is its occurrence in some words having the same phonetic. Thus we may append final P to 去 'Chü to go and write it K' or because P final occurs in 壺 K'op. For the same reason we may write 蓋 Kai, with the restored final K'ap.

2. The second ground for believing in the existence of these lost finals is usage in dialects. Thus 被 Pei 俾 Pei, *to give, to cause, to cover* &c. take final T in some dialects. For example at Shanghai *to give* is P'et. The T is indeed lost but the word is in the JU SHENG, and the vowel E never in the dialect of that place occurs in words having K final. Limited to T and P we adopt the former from other considerations.

3. The third source of proof is in the Tonic dictionaries of A. D. 400 to 800. By these books we may discover irregularities in modern dialects. Thus 法 Pap is at Amoy hwat. The phonetic 去 should have only the final P. The old dictionaries correct this irregularity and give the sound PAP. That volume of the Kwang yun which treats of the JU SHENG words, contains for example the phonetic 尼 Nir with the radical for *sickness* and 介 Kat with the radical for *stone* both with the final T? Thus where the dialects fail to inform us, the dictionaries come to our aid. We may under their protection recognize in the word for boundary 界 Kiai, KAT the common root KAT, *to cut*. Where the dialects contradict the dictionaries, the dictionaries must be preferred because of their greater age and the care taken by the authors in the construction of the syllabic system of writing sounds.

4. The fourth ground of conviction on the extensive loss of old final consonants in long tone or open syllable phonetics is the rhyme of the old poetry in which we may be guided by native scholars, in collecting data and by the light of philological inquiry in reading their true significance. For example Twan-yu-t'sai in his 六書音韻表 Lu-shu-

yin-yün-pian, by far the most useful and original work on this subject, places together all the words that rhyme in the Classics and makes a complete index of them with references to the chapters and sections. This work is invaluable for our investigation, but it must not be followed implicitly. No native scholar without the use of the alphabet could read aright the meaning of his facts. He places 小, 樂, 虞, 勞, 高 in the first tone rhyming without a final. Here we must correct him. How could 樂 and 虞, which still retain K have been then without it? We therefore are compelled to transfer these and all words rhyming with them to the short tone and introduce a final K.

5. The fifth source of correct knowledge on the lost finals of clipped words is in words which while differently written by the Chinese are alike in meaning. Thus among the words for "boat" are found the phonetics 孚, 付, Fu and these do not occur in the JU SHENG or short tone. But with a slight change in the sound we find JU SHENG phonetics used in writing words also meaning boat, as in 筏 BAT. We inquire therefore if T has not been lost from 孚 Fu to float and 付 Fu to give. We find the introduction of this T in fact helps to remove much mystery and darkness.

6. The last source of information to be now mentioned upon the loss of certain final letters is in cognate languages. In the example just given the English float, boat, bear, are the same word transmogrified by the effects of time. The phonetic 花 Hwa or K'ap to change, renovate, flower, beautiful, recovers its lost P by comparing the Mongol hobillu *le transformed* habilgan, a transformed being and the Hebrew hafahh, change,

turn, destroy. If we search for this root in the Indo European languages it has somewhat changed its meaning and taken that of mercantile exchange. To the Chinese the word means to spend, waste as in 花 Hwa, to spend or "a flower" which becomes beautiful by the transforming power of nature exercised on the brown earth. To the Turanian, transformation was the prominent idea. To the Semite, destructive change was the chief notion. But to the Arian peoples, it was appropriated as will now be shewn to the use of commerce.

(To be continued.)

NOTES, QUERIES AND REPLIES.

TWO ARTICLES OF LUXURY.

NOTE 5.—There are two articles of luxury at present in the Canton market; they are both water beetles. The one a cleoptera, belonging apparently to the dytiscidae; its body is oval and convex, 1 inch 4 lines long; greatest width about $\frac{1}{4}$ from tip of abdomen, 8 lines; shining, brownish black; hind legs formed for swimming, large, flat, fringed with hairs, tarsi five jointed, two spurs on each. Middle pair similar but much smaller; front pair armed with double hooks. Head rather large bent down, eyes prominent, antennae long, in front of the eyes, mandibles very small. Its general appearance is that of the Dytiscus dimidiatus. A narrow amber colored band passes round the elytra just within the margin.

The second is an Heteroptera, notohectidae? Front pair of wings large, bases leathery, ends membranous, partly overlapping; body flat, with two filaments attached to abdomen; hind legs flat, edges hairy, tarsi large with two slender claws; front legs raptorial, tarsi jointed, with one strong claw, last tibia folds into a groove in the upper one, the claw being almost hidden. Strong beak, with long sharp needle, jointed to bend under thorax, head narrow, eyes large. General shape parallelsides, with ends tapering, nearly 3 inches long, and 1 inch wide. Color dirty brown.

Are they used as food elsewhere in China?

F. H. E.

BIRTH.

At Ningpo, February 22nd 1872, the wife of Mrs. S. P. BORCHERT, of a son.

Continued from 2nd page of cover.

1990

For the above books apply to the Editor of
The Liberator
Boston, March 1872.
Williams' Canton Dictionary, in good
order, apply to W. C. Hill, Esq.
Canton, Mass. 16.00

10

The Second Volume will comprise Parts II and III, and also be about 140 pages.

Those in China who wish to subscribe will please send in their names to Agents.

Relating to 2nd Volume see 4th page of

[illegible]